

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over a document "Microsoft Office 97" (Moseley, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,580,438 (Ichimura, et al.). Claim 16 was not rejected over the prior art, but was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, as being indefinite.

Applicant herein asks that independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 14 be amended to better define the subject matters of these claims. Also, the language of Claims 3, 7 and 11 are being amended to be consistent with the language of Claims 1, 5 and 9 respectively, and editorial changes are being made to Claim 16.

For the reasons set forth below, Claim 16 is clear and definite and fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. In addition, all of Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11 and 13-16 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is thus asked to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112 and the rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11 and 13-15 under 103, and to allow Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11 and 13-16.

In rejecting Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, the Examiner commented that he could not find support in the specification for a "navigation routine," which is described in the claim. The Examiner also indicated that the term "read title" in claim 16 could be interpreted as a different title than that of the "title" that is described in Claim 1, from which Claim 16 depends.

The navigation routine referred to in Claim 16 is discussed in the specification on page 5, lines 22-27 and on page 6, lines 6-14, where this routine is referred to as "the Navigational HTML." This routine is also shown in Figure 2 under the heading "Navigation." This routine provides links that, in the preferred embodiment of the invention, are used to find the style sheet using the name of the Web page.

In view of the Examiner's objection, Applicant herein asks that Claim 16 be amended to change "the read title" to "the read title of the Web page." It is believed that, with this change, it is absolutely clear that the "title" referred to in Claim 16 is the title of the Web page.

Applicant's Attorneys have carefully reviewed Claim 16, and this claim is clear and definite and fully complies with the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112. Accordingly, the

Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112. Since this claim has not been rejected over the prior art, it is believed that Claim 16 is now allowable.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103, these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art because that prior art does not show or suggest the use of the read title of the Web page to call the style sheet that, in turn, is used to alter the style attributes of the Web page, as described in independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 14. In order to best understand this difference between the present invention and the prior art, Applicant will briefly discuss the invention and the prior art.

The present invention, generally, relates to a method and system to automatically change the style attributes of a web page based on the title of that web page. With this invention, when a web page is added to a web site, that page is given a title according to a defined procedure; and in particular, the title includes the name of the section of the Web site to which the page is being added.

When the Web page is selected by a user for viewing, a computer program reads the page title, and, based on that read title, identifies the name of the section of the Web site in which the web page occurs. This section name is used to call a style sheet having its own style attributes, and these style attributes of the style sheet are used to alter the style sheets of the web page to show the web site section name in a predetermined manner on the web page. For instance, this section name may be highlighted and shown in a specified location of the web page, both determined by the style attributes of the style sheet.

Mosely, et al. discloses a Web page having a heading determined by a defined procedure. However, as the Examiner has recognized, there are a number of important features of the present invention that are not shown in or suggested by Mosely, et al. For example, Mosely, et al. does not suggest using that heading to change style attributes of the web page.

In order to address the deficiencies of Mosely, et al. as a reference, the Examiner relies on Ichimura, et al. This reference discloses a procedure for maintaining a uniform appearance during a video presentation, for example when different slides are shown. Ichimura, et al, like Mosely, does not show or suggest using the title of a web page to call a style sheet to alter the style attributes of that web page.

Independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 14 describe this feature of the present invention. In particular, each of these claims describes the feature that the title of the web page is used to call the style sheet that, in turn, is used to alter the style attributes of the web page to show the section name of the Web site in a manner specified by the style sheet.

This feature is of considerable utility because it helps to automate the procedure for showing the section name of the Web site in a consistent manner from page to page. As long as the naming convention established within the script is used for the Web page title, and the link Ids are established, no manual intervention is required by the developer. Also, this invention is very compact, since no variables need to be hard coded, the invention can be used globally throughout all sections of the Web site, and the invention requires no additional maintenance once the script is implemented.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and these other references, whether considered individually or in combination, also do not disclose or suggest this feature of the invention.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 14 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those difference, Claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 14 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2, 3, 15 and 16 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 1. Likewise, Claims 6 and 7 are dependent from Claim 5 and are allowable therewith, and Claims 10 and 11 are dependent form Claim 9 and are allowable therewith.

The amendments requested herein elaborate on features already described in the claims. Specifically, the claims presently describe the web page, a title for the web page, and a style sheet, and the requested changes describe more expressly that the title of the web page is used to call the style sheet. Further, the last Office Action was the first time that Ichimura, et al. was applied against the claims, and it is believed that Applicant should have an opportunity to make the amendments requested herein in response to this new rejection. It is thus believed that entry of this Amendment is appropriate, and such entry is respectfully requested.

For the reasons discussed above, the Examiner is asked to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112 and the rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102, and to allow Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11 and 13-16.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicant

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:gc